IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to waive costs (Doc. 157) is

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel (Doc. 157)

denied without prejudice to Plaintiff making a showing on an item by item basis of exactly

which costs he is seeking to have waived and why such waiver is necessary for his case.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Case 2:09-cv-00630-JAT Document 172 Filed 03/05/13 Page 2 of 2

is denied. There is no constitutional right to appointment of counsel in a civil case. *Ivey v. Bd. of Regents of Univ. of Alaska*, 673 F.2d 266, 269 (9th Cir. 1982). The Court, however, does have the discretion to allow litigants to proceed *in forma pauperis* and to appoint counsel in "exceptional circumstances." *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915; *Wilborn v. Escalderon*, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986); *Aldabe v. Aldabe*, 616 F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 1980). In order to determine whether exceptional circumstances exist, the Court evaluates the plaintiff's "'likelihood of success on the merits [and] the ability of the [plaintiff] to articulate his or her claim *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved." *Richard v. Harper*, 864 F.2d 85, 87 (9th Cir. 1988) (quoting *Weygant v. Look*, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983)); *see also Wilborn*, 789 F.2d at 1331. Neither factor is determinative, and the Court must consider both factors before reaching a decision on a request for appointment of counsel. *See Wilborn*, 789 F.2d at 1331.

Here, Plaintiff has shown some likelihood of success on the merits, however the legal issues are not complex, and Plaintiff has demonstrated a high ability to articulate his claims *pro se*. Further, Plaintiff will be out of custody at the time of trial; thereby allowing him more time to prepare for his case. Thus, the Court does not find appointment of counsel to be warranted in this case.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion for status review (Doc. 161) is denied.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED granting Plaintiff's motion to exclude defense witnesses from the courtroom during trial (Doc. 162); this Order is without prejudice to defense counsel raising at the time of trial whether the defense expert(s) should be allowed in the courtroom for the entire trial.

DATED this 5th day of March, 2013.

James A. Teilborg

Senior United States District Judge